

## REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview of February 2, 2006 wherein the structural differences between the invention of the instant application and the Nakamura reference were discussed. While no agreement as to the claims was made, the structural differences of the plunger 26 of the instant invention and the plunger 34 of Nakamura were described. Applicants undersigned representative indicated that the Examiner has incorrectly identified the piston 30 and/or the plunger holder 28 of Nakamura as the claimed plunger. An RCE is being submitted herewith to clarify the claim and describe those differences. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for her consideration of the matter.

This is in response to the final office action dated November 3, 2005 wherein claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamura et al and claim 4 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al in view of Namie et al.


Claim 3 has been amended to clarify that the plunger 26 engages the wrapping transmission member and that plunger 26 includes a rack thereon for interaction with the pawl as claimed. Nakamura does not have this structure. Rather, Nakamura has a piston 30/plunger holder 28 as described at col. 4, line 40 which includes a rack thereon. Nakamura describes its plunger as item 34 at col. 4, line 22.

Claim 4 is dependent on allowable claim 3 and reconsideration is respectfully

requested.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODLING, KROST AND RUST

By 

Kenneth L. Mitchell

Ohio Bar Reg. No. 31587

Florida Bar Reg. No. 382531

Patent Attorney, Reg. No. 36,873

Registered Professional Engineer, Reg. No. 54455

Woodling, Krost and Rust

9213 Chillicothe Road

Kirtland, Ohio 44094

phone nos. 866-241-4150 (toll free), 440-256-4150;

fax nos. 866-241-4043 (toll free), 440-256-7453;

cell no. 440-487-2694

[clevepat@aol.com](mailto:clevepat@aol.com)

[clevepat@sbcglobal.net](mailto:clevepat@sbcglobal.net)